

coating work pieces, such as printed circuit boards, during their manufacture, and has nothing to do with cooling. Moreover, the Morris patent discloses a device intended to solve the problem of over-spray, that is to say the spraying of coating material on to the manufacturing equipment itself, rather than on to the work piece. The Patel et al. patent
5 discloses a spray-cooling device using an incremental sprayer, wherein the flow rate “can be varied to adjust the flow rate to an optimal level” (Patel et al., col. 6, lines 43-45).

“[I]t is necessary to consider the reality of the circumstances, . . . -in other words, common sense -in deciding in which fields a person of ordinary skill would reasonably be
10 expected to look for a solution to the problem facing the inventor.” In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1447 (Fed. Cir. 1992). “The combination of elements from non-analogous sources, in a manner that reconstructs the applicant’s invention only with the benefit of hindsight, is insufficient to present a prima facie case of obviousness. There must be some reason, suggestion, or motivation found in the prior art whereby a person of ordinary skill in the
15 field of the invention would make the combination. That knowledge can not come from the applicant’s invention itself. . . .” In re Oetiker, at 1446.

“[W]ith regard to prior art outside the field of [the inventor’s] endeavor, we only presume knowledge from those arts reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with
20 which the inventor was involved. The rationale behind this rule precluding rejections based on combination of teachings of references from nonanalogous arts is the realization that an inventor could not possibly be aware of every teaching in every art.” In re Clay, 966 F.2d 656, 23 USPQ 2d 1058, 1060-61 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

25 The Patel et al. device does not suffer from overspray (i.e., the spraying of fluid on surfaces other than those intended), the problem for which the Morris patent purportedly provides a solution. Indeed, the Patel et al. device explicitly teaches sensors to prevent the excessive spraying of cooling-fluid on the intended spray surfaces. Thus, the Patel et al. device fails to suffer any deficiency for which the Morris patent teaches a solution.

30 Moreover, those skilled in the art of applicants’ invention would not turn to manufacturing device spray-coating patents to come up with new technology for forming

“an easily maintainable spray-cooling system that maximizes spray-cooling efficiency for a plurality of components on a printed circuit board, while minimizing system cost” (the problem facing the present applicant, as described at the end of the Background of the Invention).

5

Thus, the scope of claim 1 (pertaining to a delivery system for delivering cooling fluid to cool a hot component) does not justify incorporating significantly different arts into the application's relevant prior art. Moreover, the cited references to not disclose a problem and a solution to justify combining patents from two disparate arts.

10

Because Morris is not analogous art, applicants respectfully request the rejection of claim 1, and the objection to claims 2-16 be withdrawn.

15 2. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

20

Respectfully submitted,

BASH et al.

25

By: 

John A. Griecci

Registration No. 39,694

For: The Law Office of John A. Griecci

30

703 Pier Avenue, Suite B #657
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254
(310) 376-6527